UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,435	11/25/2003	Vampo Cosimo	FR920030008US1	7141

50170 7590 02/06/2007

IBM CORP. (WIP)
c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.
P.O. BOX 832745
RICHARDSON, TX 75083

EXAMINER	
NEWAY, SAMUEL G	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2626	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/721,435	COSIMO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Samuel G. Neway	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 8-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 8-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Amendment filed 12/18/2006.

2. Claims 1 – 6, and 8 – 21 are pending and are considered below.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 8 depends on Claim 7, which has been canceled. It is believed Claim 8 should depend on Claim 1 and is treated as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 2 – 3 and 5 recite the limitation "the at least one previously disabled portion". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is only a first portion that is disabled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 6, 9 – 14, and 16 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chenier (US PGPub 2004/0003383) in view of Storisteneau (CA 2256931).

Claims 1, and 9 - 13:

Chenier discloses a method, a system, and a medium of editing program code on a data processing system, the program code being suitable for subsequent processing, wherein the method includes the steps of:

defining at least one portion of the program code (paragraph 5),

selecting at least one defined portion (paragraph 5),

and automatically disabling the at least one selected portion, the at least one disabled portion being excluded from the subsequent processing (paragraph 5).

Chenier does not explicitly disclose compressing a representation of the first defined portion in a visual representation of the program code.

Storisteneau discloses a similar source code editing method compressing a representation of a first defined portion in a visual representation of the program code ("nodes of the graph represent sub-component of components of the program", page 3, lines 15-17, figs. 1, 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the compression feature as claimed in the instant claims in Chenier's method in order to improve graphical representation of source code and enhance program comprehension (Storisteneau, page 2, lines 25-27).

Claim 6:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method according to claim 1, Chenier further discloses wherein the step of defining the two portions of the program code includes: enclosing each portion between a starting comment and an ending comment ("...replace the command with comments", paragraph 33).

Claim 14:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method of claim 1, Chenier further discloses a method where the first defined portion is a service instruction portion, and where disabling the service instruction portion comprises automatically converting the service instructions in the service instruction portion to comments in the program code by inserting comment tags in association with the service instructions. ("...replace the command with comments", paragraph 33).

Claims 16, 17:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method of claim 1, but Chenier does not explicitly disclose compressing the representation of the first defined portion.

Storisteneau discloses where compressing the representation of the first defined portion in the visual representation of the program code comprises: replacing a visual representation of the content of the first defined portion with an identifier of the first defined portion, the identifier indicating a position in the program code where the first defined portion was present but not containing contents of the first defined portion; and inserting, into the visual representation of the program code, an compression identifier in association with the identifier of the first defined portion, the compression identifier

indicating that the first defined portion has been compressed ("minimized ... ", page 16, line 25, figs. 2-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the compression feature as claimed in the instant claims in Chenier's method in order to improve graphical representation of source code and enhance program comprehension (Storisteneau, page 2, lines 25-27).

Claims 18, 19:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method of claim 1, but Chenier does not explicitly disclose wherein at least one of the at least two portions of the program code has an associated level, and wherein selecting a first defined portion of the at least two portions of the program code comprises receiving an input specifying a level such that portions of program code equal to or above the specified level are visually represented in the visual representation of the program code, and wherein portions of the program code that are not equal to or above the specified level are automatically compressed in the visual representation of the program code such that they are not visible

Storisteneau discloses wherein at least one of the at least two portions of the program code has an associated level ("hierarchical relationship between source code", page 4, lines 1-5), and wherein selecting a first defined portion of the at least two portions of the program code comprises receiving an input specifying a level such that portions of program code equal to or above the specified level are visually represented in the visual representation of the program code, and wherein portions of the program code that are not equal to or above the specified level are automatically compressed in

the visual representation of the program code such that they are not visible ("a list of other components which call on a component associated with a source node 54 which can be opened for editing from a pop-up menu", page 7, lines 1-5, figs. 2-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the compression feature as claimed in the instant claims in Chenier's method in order to improve graphical representation of source code and enhance program comprehension (Storisteneau, page 2, lines 25-27).

Claim 20:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method of claim 1; Chenier does not explicitly disclose a visual representation.

Storisteneau discloses wherein only portions of the program code that are visible in the visual representation of the program code are stored in a compressed version of the program code ("changes to the document are recorded", page 18, lines 21-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the compression feature as claimed in the instant claims in Chenier's method in order to improve graphical representation of source code and enhance program comprehension (Storisteneau, page 2, lines 25-27).

Claim 21:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method of claim 1, Chenier further discloses wherein the first defined portion of the program code is a comment in the program code, the method further comprising: moving the first defined portion from its original position in the program code to a predetermined position within the program

code to thereby generate re-organized program code ("...information stripped out...", paragraph 5); and storing the re-organized program code ("...source code to be stored...", paragraph 33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2 – 5, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chenier in view of Storisteneau and in further view of Endejan (USPGPub 2002/0184611).

Claim 2:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method according to claim 1, but do not explicitly disclose further including the steps of: selecting at least one previously disabled portion, and automatically re-enabling the at least one selected previously disabled portion.

Endejan discloses a similar system with an editor displaying active and inactive pieces of code in separate displays. Endejan also discloses selecting at least one previously disabled portion, and automatically re-enabling the at least one selected previously disabled portion ("... from the inactive display format to the active display format...", paragraph 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically re-enable portions of code that had previously been disabled. One would have been motivated to select and re-enable some portions of code to better maintain the code by reinstating comments or debugging capabilities if for example some formally unforeseen or unsuspected bug was discovered.

Claim 3:

Chenier, Storisteneau, and Endejan disclose the method according to claim 2, Chenier also discloses further including the step of:

assigning each defined portion to a category of a set including at least one category ("... identifies the code element and the comment element...", see Abstract),

the step of selecting the first defined portion (paragraph 5)

and the step of selecting the at least one previously disabled portion including selecting at least one category (paragraph 5).

Claim 4:

Chenier, Storisteneau, and Endejan disclose the method according to claim 3, Chenier also discloses the set including at least one category for service instructions ("... code in a program for testing and debugging purposes." paragraph 3).

Claim 5:

Chenier, Storisteneau, and Endejan disclose the method according to claim 2, Chenier also discloses the program code including a plurality of instructions, the step of automatically disabling the first selected portion including converting each

corresponding instruction into a comment (paragraphs 5, 33), but he does not disclose the step of automatically re-enabling the first selected previously disabled portion including restoring each corresponding instruction.

Endejan discloses selecting at least one previously disabled portion, and automatically re-enabling the at least one selected previously disabled portion ("... from the inactive display format to the active display format...", paragraph 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically re-enable portions of code that had previously been disabled. One would have been motivated to select and re-enable some portions of code to better maintain the code by reinstating comments or debugging capabilities if for example some formally unforeseen or unsuspected bug was discovered.

Claim 8:

Chenier, Storisteneau, and Endejan disclose the method according to claim 7, Chenier also discloses further including the steps of: updating the program code by removing the first defined portion ("...information stripped out...", paragraph 5), and storing the updated program code ("...source code to be stored...", paragraph 33).

Claim 15:

Chenier and Storisteneau disclose the method of claim 14, but do not explicitly disclose :

receiving an input to re-enable the first defined portion; and automatically re-enabling the first defined portion in response to receiving the input, wherein re-enabling the first

defined portion comprises removing the comment tags associated with the service instructions.

Endejan discloses selecting at least one previously disabled portion, and automatically re-enabling the at least one selected previously disabled portion ("... from the inactive display format to the active display format...", paragraph 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically re-enable portions of code that had previously been disabled. One would have been motivated to select and re-enable some portions of code to better maintain the code by reinstating comments or debugging capabilities if for example some formally unforeseen or unsuspected bug was discovered.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's argument with respect to Storisteneau (US Patent No. 6,792,595) and the fact that it is not prior art under 35 U.S.C § 103(c) has been considered and is persuasive. The finality of the last Office Action is withdrawn.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SN

SN

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600